REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-33 are pending.

Claims 1-4, and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirobumi, Japanese Publication No. 2000-306026, hereinafter referred to as "Hirobumi," in view of Spain, U.S. Patent No. 7,058,811, hereinafter referred to as "Spain." Spain in newly cited and newly relied upon.

In accordance with the foregoing, the claims are amended relative to the entered After Final Amendment of June 21, 2007, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this Amendment.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

RESPONSE TO ADVISORY ACTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 14 and 18 are amended, taking into consideration the Examiner's comments.

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 is amended for clarity to recite:

> An information processing method in executed by a center system, said information processing method comprising:
>
> receiving a first digital signature for specific data stored in said center system and a request to allow data concerning a first user to be allowed to read said stored specific data, from a terminal of a second user;
>
> confirming if an authority to give said first user permission to read said stored specific data is granted to said second user by comparing the received first digital signature with a second digital signature, which is registered in a data storage unit so as to correspond to said stored specific data; and
>
> if said first signature and said second signature are identical, performing a processing for enabling said first user to read said stored specific data.

Support for the claim amendment can be found, for example, in the Specification at page 10, line 23 to page 11, line 8 and in FIG. 6.

The Advisory Action, at page 2, asserts, "the limitation recited as 'receiving a first digital

signature for specific data and data concerning a first user to be allowed to read said specific data, from a terminal of a second user' can not explicitly implies that the second user is the one generating the first digital signature and it is the second user who is requesting the center so that its gets permission from the center and finds out that it has the authority to give said first user permission to read specific data." However, the embodiment according to claim 1 does not specify where the first digital signature is generated. Thus there appears to be no basis for the Office Action's assertion. Claim 1 recites, in part, "An information processing method in executed by a center system, said information processing method comprising: receiving a first digital signature for specific data stored in said center system and a request to allow data concerning a first user to be allowed to read said stored specific data, from a terminal of a second user," and, as thus clearly stated in the claim, the center system receives the first digital signature from a terminal of a second user. Thus, regardless of where the "first digital signature" is generated, the center system receives the first digital signature from a terminal of a second user.

The Advisory Action further asserts:

> 4. If the center system is comprising of an entity other than the second computer that makes the decision to inform the second computer that the second user/computer/terminal has the authority to let the first computer read/update **specific data stored in the second computer** then that entity has to some how be indicted in the body of the claim itself other than the preamble. This is because a 'center system' which is recited in the preamble can not only be this single entity/the decision maker as applicant argued but comprised of different entities such as the first computer, second computer and the other entity who makes the decision. In the absence of this examiner interpretation that the second computer is making the decision is correct and valid

(emphasis added).

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 is amended for clarity to recite, in part, "An information processing method in executed by a center system, said information processing method comprising: receiving a first digital signature for specific data stored in said center system and a request to allow data concerning a first user to be allowed to read said stored specific data, from a terminal of a second user." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended clearly state that the specific data is stored in the center system.

Further, claim 1 recites, in part "information processing method in executed by a center system ... confirming if an authority to give said first user permission to read said stored specific data is granted to said second user," and, thus, the claimed "center system" is clearly executing the "confirming" rather than the second computer as asserted in the Advisory Action since the

specific data is stored in the center system rather than the second computer as asserted in the Office Action.

As noted above, the Advisory Action at item 4 asserts "In the absence of this examiner interpretation that the second computer is making the decision is correct and valid." In accordance with the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, clarify that the "center system" is performing the claimed "confirming" and that the "center system" is storing the "specific data." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be based upon Hirobumi and Spain, because there is no evidence that one skilled in the art would modify Hirobumi, Spain or a combination of Hirobumi and Spain to include the claimed "information processing method in executed by a center system, said information processing method comprising: receiving a first digital signature for specific data stored in said center system and a request to allow data concerning a first user to be allowed to read said stored specific data, from a terminal of a second user; confirming if an authority to give said first user permission to read said stored specific data is granted to said second user by comparing the received first digital signature with a second digital signature, which is registered in a data storage unit so as to correspond to said stored specific data; and if said first signature and said second signature are identical, performing a processing for enabling said first user to read said stored specific data," as recited in claim 1, because the Office Action and Advisory Action's interpretation of the claims is not appropriate in view of the amended claims.

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration of the claims in view of the foregoing as well as the arguments presented in the Amendment filed June 21, 2007 is respectfully requested. It is believed, in view of the claim amendments and remarks, the claims are in condition for allowance.

INTERVIEW REQUEST:

As discussed in the telephone conference with the Examiner on July 18, 2007, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule an interview.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _July 23 2007_   By: _____

Matthew H. Polson
Registration No. 58,841

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501